



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,813	02/28/2002	Steven James Wojcik	KCX-450 (16960)	2378
7590	03/24/2005		EXAMINER	
Neal P. Pierotti Dority & Manning, Attorneys at Law, P.A. P.O. Box 1449 Greenville, SC 29602			HAUGLAND, SCOTT J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3654	

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/085,813	WOJCIK ET AL.	
	Examiner Scott Haugland	Art Unit 3654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 February 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-59 and 61-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-59 and 61-70 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/16/05 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-36, 59, and 61-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

There is no disclosure in the original application that the web is fed continuously to the web transport apparatus as recited in claim 1, lines 11-12, claim 31, line 3, claim

Art Unit: 3654

34, line 3, claim 59, lines 13-14, claim 61, lines 10-11, claim 62, line 3, claim 63, line 3, claim 64, lines 10-11, claim 65, line 3, claim 66, line 3, as opposed to intermittently or interruptedly.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 37-59, 68, and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The language of claim 37, lines 13-15 and claim 38, lines 14 and 15 appears inaccurate since the rolled product is formed on and is supported by the mandrels and, therefore, rotates with the mandrels during winding.

As disclosed, the center winding means, surface winding means, and combination center and surface winding means are not all separate elements as recited in claim 59.

It is not clear what is meant by the rates recited in claim 68 being different. It is not clear how one would make a meaningful comparison between a rate of winding and a rate of loading cores or of stripping product. It is, also, noted that for each roll of web that is wound, one core is loaded and one completed roll is removed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Billingsley (U.S. Patent No. 3,157,371).

Billingsley discloses a winder for winding a web to produce a rolled product comprising a web transport apparatus 14 and two independent winding modules (col. 4, lines 46-52) located in a radial arrangement having mandrels 17, 18, 19, 20 driven by motor M2 (Fig. 2; col. 3, lines 23-28). Cores 15, 16 on which web is wound are mounted on the mandrels. The web is wound on the mandrels by surface winding (col. 3, lines 23-35 and 46-61).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 13-17, 20, 22-31, 37, 38, 40, 46-48, 51, 52, 54-57, 59, 61-63, and 65-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morizzo in view of Kammann (U.S. Patent No. 5,437,417).

Morizzo discloses a winder for winding a web to produce a rolled product comprising a web transport apparatus 36, 44, a plurality of independent winding modules 20, 20' located in a substantially linear arrangement that wind web by surface winding onto mandrels 22 driven by rollers 58, 62, positioning apparatus for moving the winding modules into engagement with the web (including motor 82 which positions frame 70 and rollers 58, 60, winding roller 58 connected to a vacuum source for holding the web against roller 58, and feed piston 68 which moves conveyor belt 38 upward -- see col. 6, line 53-col. 7, line 5), core loading apparatus 52, 90, 92, 93, product stripping apparatus (cylinder 72, discharge plate 73, transport assembly 56), and waste removal means (col. 7, line 62- col. 8, line 13). The mandrel 22 is movably positioned so that the distance between the web transport and winding module varies. Web is attached to the core 22 by adhesion (col. 6, lines 13-19). The formed rolled product includes core 22, 122 (col. 6, lines 10-13). Morizzo discloses a method of producing rolled product in which only one independent winding module winds at any given time (col. 9, line 40 - col. 10, line 4).

One winding module of Morizzo is capable of operating when another is shut down or disabled since the disclosed process of using the device involves winding with one module while another is not winding (col. 9, line 40 - col. 10, line 4). Further, the additional modules (beyond one) are not required for operation, but are present to

speed the winding process (col. 9, lines 25-28), so the winder is capable of winding with only one functioning module.

Morizzo does not disclose that the winder is configured to form a rolled product by only center winding, by only surface winding, and by only combinations of center and surface winding. Morizzo does not disclose that the winding apparatus is located at the end of a tissue machine or a paper making machine or the step of providing slit web to be wound.

Kammann teaches providing a winder for winding a web to produce a rolled product with a winding module capable of forming a rolled product by center winding, surface winding, or combinations.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the winding modules to form a rolled product by only center winding, only surface winding, and only combinations of center and surface winding as taught by Kammann to adapt the device for improved winding of a greater range of materials.

With regard to claims 5 and 13, the web transport apparatus is seen to be a vacuum conveyor since it uses vacuum plate 44 in the conveying process.

With regard to claims 16 and 17, winding is inherently affected by controlling tension on the web and controlling torque of the winding modules.

With regard to claim 24, when three or more modules are present in the apparatus of Morizzo (col. 9, lines 25-28), the winding modules are in different planes as one fills while at least one other is idle or is being emptied by a discharge

Art Unit: 3654

mechanism (col. 8, lines 58-62). In addition, the two winding modules shown in the drawings are in different vertical planes.

With regard to claim 25, the winding modules of Morizzo are seen to be configured for winding slit web since they are capable of winding plural parallel slit webs on a single core or coaxial cores.

With regard to claims 26 and 27, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to locate the winding apparatus of Morizzo at the end of a tissue machine or a paper making machine to wind the web produced thereby since the apparatus of Morizzo is clearly capable of winding tissue or other paper.

With regard to claim 28, the winding modules of Morizzo are inherently capable of producing rolled product having different sheet counts by stopping the winding process at different points.

With regard to claim 38, three or more modules are disclosed (col. 9, lines 25-28).

With regard to claim 40, the web transport apparatus is seen to be a vacuum conveyor since it uses vacuum plate 44 in the conveying process.

With regard to claims 23 and 47, the winding modules are in a radial arrangement since they lie along radii originating from the same point, although the radii may not all be of equal length.

With regard to claim 48, when three or more modules are present (col. 9, lines 25-28), the winding modules are in different planes as one fills while at least one other

is idle or is being emptied by a discharge mechanism (col. 8, lines 58-62). In addition, the two winding modules shown in the drawings are in different vertical planes.

With regard to claims 54 and 55, Morizzo does not disclose that the winding apparatus is located at the end of a tissue machine or a paper making machine. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to locate winding apparatus of Morizzo at the end of a tissue machine or a paper making machine to wind the web produced thereby since the apparatus of Morizzo is clearly capable of winding tissue or other paper.

With regard to claim 56, the winding modules of Morizzo are inherently capable of producing rolled product having different sheet counts by stopping the winding process at different points.

With regard to claim 57, the winding modules of Morizzo are seen to be configured for winding slit web since they are capable of winding plural parallel slit webs on a single core or coaxial cores.

With regard to claim 63, it would have been an obvious use of the winder of Morizzo as modified to wind with at least two modules at a time to increase the winding rate.

With regard to claim 68, the winding modules of Morizzo appear to be as capable of winding web at a rate different than the rate at which cores are loaded and product is stripped from the winding module as are the winding modules of Applicants' invention.

With regard to claim 69, the winding modules of Morizzo are capable of producing rolled product having different roll attributes (e.g., material, diameter).

With regard to claim 70, the winding modules of Morizzo are capable of producing rolled product having different roll attributes (e.g., material, diameter).

Claims 3, 45, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morizzo in view of Kammann as applied to claims 1 and 38, and further in view of Diltz (U.S. Patent No. 3,869,095).

Morizzo is described above.

Morizzo does not disclose a brake controlled mandrel, a perforated core, or a vacuum supplied mandrel.

Diltz teaches making a winding mandrel brake controlled to decelerate a completed roll wound on the mandrel (col. 7, lines 17-29). Diltz teaches providing perforated cores 88 and vacuum supplied mandrels 40, 41 for attaching a leading end of web to be wound to the cores. Diltz teaches providing an air blast (col. 8, lines 26-33) for redirecting a leading end of a web to be wound onto a winding module.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the winding modules of Morizzo with brake controlled mandrels as taught by Diltz to decelerate a completed product roll. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Morizzo with perforated cores and vacuum supplied mandrels and an air blast for redirecting web onto the cores as taught by Diltz to attach web to the cores without the need for adhesive.

Claims 5, 6, 13, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morizzo in view of Kammann as applied to claims 1, 2, 4, and 38 above, and further in view of Nistri et al (U.S. Pat. No. 4,583,698).

Nistri et al teaches using a vacuum conveyor 9 and vacuum roll 8 to feed and facilitate threading of a web in a winder.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Morizzo with a vacuum conveyor or vacuum roll for feeding the web to the winding modules as taught by Nistri et al to maintain feeding engagement with the web and to facilitate threading through the winding apparatus.

Claims 7 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morizzo in view of Kammann as applied to claims 1 and 38, and further in view of Menz et al (doc. no. WO 98/52857).

Morizzo does not disclose a web transport apparatus that is an electrostatic belt. Menz et al teaches using an electrostatic belt (in lieu of rollers 3, 4) to feed web material (page 6, third full paragraph; col. 3, lines 24-29 of corresponding US Pat. No. 6,264,132).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Morizzo with a web transport apparatus in the form of an electrostatic belt as taught by Menz et al to provide more positive gripping and feeding of the web.

Art Unit: 3654

Claims 9, 21, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morizzo in view of Kammann as applied to claims 1, 2, and 38 above, and further in view of Johnson et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,497,959).

Morizzo does not disclose a vacuum mandrel.

Johnson et al teaches providing vacuum mandrels for winding coreless rolled products and teaches forming rolled products that are coreless with a cylindrical cavity in the center.

With regard to claims 9 and 42, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the winding apparatus of Morizzo with vacuum mandrels as taught by Johnson et al to allow it to form coreless rolled products.

With regard to claim 21, it would have been obvious to modify Morizzo to form a rolled product that is coreless and has a cylindrical cavity in the center as taught by Johnson to reduce the amount of packaging used.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morizzo in view of Kammann as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Pretto et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,379,964).

Morizzo does not disclose that the mandrels are made of a carbon fiber composite.

Pretto et al teaches forming a web winding mandrel of a carbon fiber composite to provide a lightweight mandrel having high strength and stiffness.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the mandrels of Morizzo of a carbon fiber composite as taught by Pretto et al to make them light weight with high strength and stiffness.

Claims 11 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morizzo in view of Kammann as applied to claims 1 and 38 above, and further in view of Dowd (U.S. Patent No. 4,133,495).

Morizzo does not disclose a tail sealing apparatus.

Dowd teaches providing a web winding apparatus with a tail sealing apparatus to prevent unwinding of an outer end of a web from a finished roll.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Morizzo with a tail sealing apparatus as taught by Dowd to prevent unwinding of an outer end of the web from a completed product roll.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morizzo in view of Kammann as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Urban (U.S. Patent No. 4,988,052).

Morizzo does not disclose applying adhesive to the leading end and trailing end of web before it engages the winding modules.

Urban teaches applying adhesive to the leading end and trailing end of web 7 being wound before it engages winding modules 4, 5, 6.

Art Unit: 3654

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply adhesive to the leading and trailing ends the web of Morizzo before it engages winding modules as taught by Urban to attach the leading and trailing ends of web to cores in plural winding modules while requiring only a single adhesive applying station.

Claims 18, 32, 33, 39, 44, 53, 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morizzo in view of Kammann as applied to claims 1, 31, and 38 above, and further in view of Billingsley (U.S. Patent No. 3,157,371).

Morizzo does not disclose providing slit web to be wound by the winding modules. Morizzo does not disclose loading a core on a mandrel. Morizzo does not disclose center and surface drives.

Billingsley teaches providing slit web to a winder (col. 1, lines 9-12). Billingsley teaches providing mandrels 18, 20 for supporting and driving cores 15, 16 mounted on them. Billingsley teaches providing a web winder with driven mandrels 17, 18, 19, 20 and a surface contacting drive (drum) 14 driven at a speed differential to improve winding characteristics (col. 3, lines 23-35). Billingsley teaches providing a winder with means to load cores onto the mandrels (col. 4, lines 39-42).

With regard to claim 32, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide slit web to the winder of Morizzo as taught by Billingsley to process long rolls into shorter ones since it would have been clear that Morizzo is usable for winding slit or unslit webs.

With regard to claims 18, 33, and 44, it would have been obvious to provide Morizzo with mandrels and cores mounted on them as taught by Billingsley to provide the necessary structure to permit the cores to be driven as suggested by Kammann. Loading of cores and accelerating the mandrels are inherent in the use of the apparatus of Morizzo as modified.

With regard to claim 39, it would have been obvious to provide Morizzo with core loading means as taught by Billingsley to automatically supply the required cores to the winder.

With regard to claim 53, it would have been obvious to provide the winding apparatus of Morizzo with a driven mandrel for receiving core and drive means for controlling the speed differential between the mandrel drive (center drive) and the surface drive as taught by Billingsley to provide Morizzo with center and surface drives to obtain increased control over the winding process and product quality.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morizzo in view of Kammann as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Oliver et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,402,960).

Morizzo does not disclose that the rolled product produced by the winding modules is solid and coreless without a cavity.

Oliver et al teaches forming a rolled web of paper as a solid roll without a core to reduce packaging materials.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the winding device of Morizzo to form a rolled product that is solid and coreless without a cavity as taught by Oliver et al reduce the quantity of packaging materials required for the product.

Claims 34-36 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morizzo in view of Kammann as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Little (U.S. Patent No. 1,648,990).

Morizzo is described above.

Morizzo does not disclose that at least two of the plurality of winding modules wind the web at any given time or providing slit web to the winding modules.

Little teaches winding web by independent winding modules such that two of the modules wind web at any given time (page 1, lines 30-40). Little teaches providing slit web to the winding modules (page 1, lines 31-35).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to operate Morizzo so that at least two winding modules wind web at any given time as taught by Little to increase the rate of production.

With regard to claim 36, it would have been obvious to provide slit web to the winding modules of Morizzo as taught by Little since the winder Morizzo would clearly have been capable of winding slit or unslit web.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 21, 23, 67, and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,497,959) in view of Kammann.

Johnson et al discloses a winder for winding a web to produce a rolled product comprising a web transport apparatus 10, 12 (of which 12 is a vacuum conveyor - see col. 3, lines 55-59) and a plurality of independent winding modules 15, 16, 17, 18 and 15', 16', 17', 18' in a radial arrangement that wind by surface winding. The winding modules have vacuum mandrels 15, 15' for winding a coreless rolled product having a cylindrical cavity in the center (col. 1, lines 10-14, Figs. 2 and 3).

Kammann teaches providing a winder for winding a web to produce a rolled product with a winding module capable of forming a rolled product by center winding, surface winding, or combinations.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the winding modules to form a rolled product by only center winding, only surface winding, and only combinations of center and surface winding as taught by Kammann to adapt the device for improved winding of a greater range of materials.

With regard to claim 2, the mandrels 15, 15' of Johnson are driven by winding drums 17, 18, 17', 18' (col. 4, lines 3-4).

With regard to claim 69, the winding modules of Johnson are capable of producing rolled product having different roll attributes (e.g., material, diameter).

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al in view of Kammann as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Urban (U.S. Patent No. 4,988,052).

Johnson et al does not disclose applying adhesive to the leading end and trailing end of web before it engages the winding modules.

Urban teaches applying adhesive to the leading end and trailing end of web 7 being wound before it engages winding modules 4,5,6.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply adhesive to the leading and trailing ends the web of Johnson et al before it engages the winding modules as taught by Urban to attach the leading and trailing ends of the web to cores in plural winding modules while requiring only a single adhesive applying station.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed 2/16/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue with regard to the rejection of claim 59 under 35 U.S.C. 112, that the center winding means, surface winding means, and combination center and surface winding means recited in claim 59 may be separate elements. However, this is not disclosed and Applicants' example (first paragraph of the remarks) is consistent with

this rejection since the mandrel is common to the center winding means and the combination center and surface winding means in the example.

Applicants remarks beginning on p. 20, line 2 concerning the rejection of claim 68 under 35 U.S.C. 112, do not clarify the issue. Are the rates of unloading finished rolls and loading empty cores being compared? A web winding rate may, for example, be expressed in feet per minute. The rate of loading cores may be expressed, for example, in units per minute. The comparison of a web winding rate with a core loading rate, especially, is not understood.

Applicants argue that the winder of Morizzo is not configured to employ center winding or combinations of center and surface winding as set forth in claims 37 and 38. However, Kammann teaches providing a web winder with a winding module capable of forming a rolled product by center winding, surface winding, or combinations. It is seen to have been obvious to provide Morizzo with modules capable of center or surface winding or combinations to increase the versatility of the winder as taught by Kammann.

Applicants argue that Morizzo does not disclose a winder in which web is continuously fed to a web transport apparatus. The web is seen to be continuously fed to the web transport apparatus of Morizzo to the extent that the web is in Applicants' disclosed apparatus since there is no disclosure of continuous web feed to the transport apparatus and since the apparatus of Morizzo is capable of uninterrupted operation when one winding module is not in use. In addition, stopping the feed rollers and conveyor assembly of Morizzo during cutting is optional (col. 7, lines 26-28). It is also noted that col. 10, lines 1-4 of Morizzo referred to by Applicants talks about a winding

process, not feeding of web to the transport apparatus. Winding can stop while a defect is removed, but feeding does not stop (except possibly momentarily for cutting) and operation of the apparatus as a whole does not stop and is not interrupted.

Applicants further argue that it would not have been obvious to combine Morizzo and Kammann because it would involve a complete change in the winder of Morizzo and the core loading and stripping functions. However, the teachings of Kammann are relevant to Morizzo since they both involve winding of webs. Kammann teaches how to adapt the device of Morizzo to a greater range of web types. The winding modules of Morizzo would need to be modified primarily to include a drive and support for the winding cores separate from the winding rollers 58, 62. It does not appear that major changes to the core loading or stripping structure would be required and any required changes would have been within the level of skill of an ordinary artisan.

Applicants argue that the winding modules of Johnson et al are not independent and that if one breaks, the other could not wind web without shutting down the winder. However, this is not the case since the winding module 15, 16, 17, 18 can wind while module 15', 16', 17', 18' is being unloaded, for example.

Applicants argue that it would not have been obvious to combine Johnson et al and Kammann since they wind web in completely different ways. Similar comments to those made above concerning the combination of Morizzo and Kammann apply. In addition, the web roll supporting and driving structure of Kammann would be compatible with the web feeding structure including roll 12 of Johnson et al due to the similarity of

the supporting arms 16, 16' of Johnson et al and the web roll supporting arm of Kammann.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Haugland whose telephone number is (703) 305-6498. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathy Matecki can be reached on (703) 308-2688. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

sjh
sjh
3/16/05

Kathy Matecki

KATHY MATECKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600